

Running head: YOUNG CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER-CHILD  
RELATIONSHIPS

Young Children's Perceptions of Teacher-Child Relationships:  
An Evaluation of Two Instruments and the Role of Child Gender in Kindergarten  
2010

Jantine L. Spilt\* and Helma M.Y. Koomen  
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Panayota Y. Mantzicopoulos  
Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

\*Corresponding author. Department of Education, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences,  
University of Amsterdam, P.O. Box 94208, 1090 GE Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
Phone: +31(0)205251272; Fax: +31(0)205251200; Email: [J.L.Spilt@uva.nl](mailto:J.L.Spilt@uva.nl)

## Young Children's Perceptions of Teacher-Child Relationships:

## An Evaluation of Two Instruments and the Role of Child Gender in Kindergarten

## Abstract

The psychometric qualities of two instruments that measure children's perceptions of teacher-child relationships were evaluated in a sample of kindergartners ( $N=150$ ): The Young Children's Appraisals of Teacher Support (Y-CATS) and the Kindergarten-Teacher Interaction Computer test (KLIC). On the Y-CATS, children judged propositions on a dichotomous response format. On the KLIC, children evaluated pictures according to a two-step response procedure to obtain a 4-point scale. Furthermore, these instruments were employed to explore gender differences in the associations between the teacher-child relationship and indices of maladaptive behavior. Teachers completed measures of relationship quality and children's behavior problems. A three-dimensional structure of the Y-CATS (Warmth, Conflict, and Autonomy Support) was found, whereas the KLIC's structure was unidimensional. The KLIC showed high reliability but stronger evidence was obtained for the validity of the Y-CATS. Consistent with attachment-based research, the results indicated that children display gender-typical problem behavior when having non-close teacher-child relationships.

Keywords: children's perceptions, teacher-child relationships, kindergarten, sex differences, behavior problems

### Young Children's Perceptions of Teacher-Child Relationships:

#### An Evaluation of Two Instruments and the Role of Child Gender in Kindergarten

Teacher-child relationships have been widely acknowledged as an important correlate of children's school readiness and subsequent school success. It has been demonstrated that children entering school adapt more easily when they are successful in forming positive relations (e.g., Birch & Ladd, 1997). Supportive teacher-child relationships facilitate the mastery of skills necessary for a successful school career and there is compelling evidence that relationship quality affects children's cognitive and social-emotional outcomes (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; O'Connor & McCartney, 2007; Pianta, Steinberg, & Rollins, 1995; Pianta & Stuhlman, 2004). For children at risk of school failure, a positive teacher-child relationship constitutes a protective factor, whereas a discordant teacher-child relationship exacerbates risk (Baker, 1999; Hughes, Cavell, & Jackson, 1999; Ladd & Burgess, 2001; Meehan, Hughes, & Cavell, 2003; Pianta et al., 1995; Silver, Measelle, Armstrong, & Essex, 2005). These findings imply that the quality of interpersonal teacher-child relations can be viewed both as a concurrent indicator of children's school adjustment and a factor either promoting or hindering children's future development (e.g., Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

It should be noted, however, that in preschool and the early school years most evidence is limited to teacher reports of teacher-child relationship quality. Little is known about the meanings that young children attribute to their relationships with teachers, and the developmental significance of children's interpersonal experiences. Interviews with elementary school children confirm that children want to experience emotionally and cognitively supportive relationships with their teachers (Daniels & Perry, 2003). Considering that relationships are dyadic constructs, we argue that an understanding of both teachers' and young children's relationship perceptions early in school is critically needed.

Researchers are in the early stages of developing measures that assess young children's perceptions of teacher-child relationships (Harrison, Clarke, & Ungerer, 2007; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003; Murray, Murray, & Waas, 2008). In this study, we contribute to these efforts by investigating the psychometric qualities of two child instruments that share the same measurement aim but have different item and administration formats. In addition, we examine the differential significance of the teacher-child relationship for boys and girls.

### *Children's versus Teachers' Perspectives on Teacher-Child Relationships*

Guided by attachment theory, research on teacher-child relationships has primarily relied on assessments based on teachers' perceptions. A significant body of that work has used the Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS; Pianta, 2001), a measure that has empirically documented a 3-dimensional structure for teacher-student relationships. Key relational dimensions are closeness (the degree of warmth and trust), conflict (discordant and coercive interactions), and dependency (overly dependent and clingy behavior of the child). The STRS has been validated in Pianta's own research and has been used in independent studies investigating academic and adjustment outcomes with diverse samples (Birch & Ladd, 1997; Kesner, 2000; Koomen, Verschueren, & Pianta, 2007).

However, reliance on teacher reports may limit our understanding of teacher-child relationships. Teacher reports are likely to reflect a professional stance based on experiences with many children, including role perceptions (i.e., being a teacher, caregiver, and socializer) and beliefs about how children should relate to adults and teachers (Pianta, 1999). Moreover, reports on the STRS appear colored by teachers' psychological functioning. For instance, teachers with lower efficacy beliefs and higher levels of depressive feelings tend to report more conflictual relationships with preschoolers than could be expected based on levels of problem behavior exhibited by the children (Hamre, Pianta, Downer, & Mashburn,

2008). Child reports, on the other hand, may be largely driven by children's emerging understandings of the degree of trust and warmth in the relationship. Generalized expectations about the psychological availability of adults based on experiences with other caregivers are likely to play a role. On the basis of attachment theory, it is believed that both teacher and child perceptions of the shared relationship are influenced by a relational history with significant others (Pianta, Hamre, & Stuhlman, 2003). Both teachers and children construct internal working models (IWMs) of the teacher-child relationship that function as frameworks for interpreting and understanding relationships with others (Bowlby, 1969, 1982). These internalized models are rooted in a social history and contain generalized feelings, cognitions, and expectations about interpersonal relationships (Pianta et al., 2003). This implies that a child and a teacher may appraise their relationship quality differently in the face of shared interpersonal experiences. Evidence suggests that teacher and student reports are related to their concurrent relationships or relationship history with other caregivers (Howes & Hamilton, 1992; Kesner, 2000). Further, the few recent studies that have assessed children's views report modest teacher-child agreement in both early and late grade school, and even when parallel assessments of teacher and child perspectives were employed (Harrison et al., 2007; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003; Murray et al., 2008; Rey, Smith, Yoon, Somers, & Barnett, 2007; Valiente, Lemery Chalfant, Swanson, & Reiser, 2008). Importantly, though teacher-child convergence is small, both teacher and child reports do make a unique contribution in the prediction of cross-year changes in adjustment (Hughes & Villarreal, 2008).

To understand children's behavior toward teachers, insight into children's understanding and perceptions of their relationship with their teacher is vital because IWMs of relationships guide behavior in dyadic interactions with others (Bowlby, 1969, 1982). This contention is supported by research that showed how reports of 9 to 13-year-old children

about the trustworthiness and psychological availability of teachers are related to their social responding and stress reactivity to negative interpersonal events (Little & Kobak, 2003).

Together, these findings underscore that teacher reports cannot substitute children's own accounts. Instead, insight into child perceptions is critical to understanding children's sense of security as well as behavior in teacher-child interactions. In this study we contribute to this line of research by investigating two new child-report measures of the teacher-student relationship.

### *Measuring Young Children's Perceptions*

To our knowledge, only a handful of studies have attempted to investigate the perceptions of five- to seven year-old children about teacher-child relationships. Three studies share similar orientations, grounded in attachment research but have focused on different key relational dimensions and have employed different test formats. Mantzicopoulos and Neuharth-Pritchett (2003) developed the Young Children's Appraisals of Teacher Support (Y-CATS) to assess young children's perceptions of teacher-child relationships. Using a dichotomous response format, the researchers asked children to indicate agreement or disagreement with an item (e.g., my teacher likes me) by placing a card in either a mailbox (true) or trashcan (untrue). There was support for three hypothesized dimensions that largely correspond with the theoretical constructs underlying teachers' reports. Warmth reflected whether the child feels cared for and valued. Conflict referred to perceived harshness and criticism of the teacher. Autonomy support represented appraisals of teacher behaviors that stimulate children to pursue their own choices and interests. Children's reports were modestly associated with teacher-rated relationship quality and school adjustment measures (Mantzicopoulos, 2005; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003). More recently, the Y-CATS was used to examine kindergartners' perceptions of support for learning and conflict during science lessons. Children with high motivation for science learning reported the most

support and the least conflict and negativity from teachers, which was confirmed by observational data (Patrick, Mantzicopoulos, Samarapungavan, & French, 2008).

Murray and colleagues (2008) focused on different forms of teacher support and used an adapted version of the My Family and Friends-Child (MFF-C) with a two-step response format. Children were first asked to affirm ('yes') or deny ('no') whether their teacher provided a certain type of support. When the answer was 'yes', children were asked to indicate the amount of support on a large picture of a barometer that contained four levels ranging from 'not at all' to 'a lot'. Only the total scale was both reliable and modestly associated with children's school liking, but unrelated to teacher-rated relationship quality.

In contrast to these two studies, Harrison and colleagues (2007) focused on relational negativity. They used an indirect approach and examined young children's drawings of the self and teacher. The results showed modest teacher-child agreement and moderate associations with children's school liking, adjustment problems, and competencies.

Finally, Valeski and Stipek (2001) used self-systems theory to frame the development of a measure of young children's feelings about school (FAS). The FAS included a reliable three-item subscale for the assessment of child-perceived teacher caring. Children's responses were assessed on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale that was illustrated with five bars of increasing size. The subscale was modestly related to teacher-reported relationship quality in first grade; only a marginally significant correlation was found in kindergarten.

Whereas all measures tapped into affective qualities of the teacher-child relationship, only the Y-CATS clearly differentiated between warmth and conflict, and was constructed along a three-dimensional framework that was theoretically consistent with that found in teacher reports. Also, relatively good support was obtained for the reliability and validity of its subscales in a sample of Head Start children. However, the factor structure was examined using common factor analysis for which conclusions are restricted to the sample collected

(Field, 2009). Research in different samples is needed to allow for generalization of the results. We pursued this goal with a sample of Dutch children. Also, we examined stability over time to provide additional support for the measure's reliability.

It could be argued that the Y-CATS obtains a relatively rough measure of children's perceptions because it utilizes a dichotomous response format (i.e., true or untrue). This may account for the relatively limited variability in mean subscale scores and the negatively skewed distributions. However, although a 3- or 4-point scale could be more sensitive to variations in children's interpersonal experiences, 5- to 6-year-old children have a tendency to respond at the extremes of Likert-type scales (Chambers & Johnston, 2002). A solution would be to adopt a two-stage process by first presenting the child with two opposing statements representing the opposite ends of a continuum (e.g., my teacher likes me vs. my teacher does not like me). After being selected by the child, the statement is followed by a dichotomous response option to obtain a finer assessment of the child's perception. This two-stage procedure has been successfully used in research on young children's self-concept (PSPCSA; Harter & Pike, 1984). In addition to the above-noted considerations, it's been argued that children's understanding of the test items could be improved when items are presented together with corresponding pictures (Eder, 1990; Eiser, Mohay, & Morse, 2000).

To address these issues, we included a new measure of children's perceptions of relationship quality that was entitled in Dutch: Kleuter-Leerkracht Interactie Computer test or KLIC when abbreviated (English translation: Kindergarten-Teacher Interaction Computer test; Van Dijk, De Graaff, Knotter, & Koster, 2006). On the KLIC, children evaluate photographs of teacher-child interactions according to a two-step response procedure. Photographs represent emotional closeness and teacher support (e.g., My teacher always listens to me), conflict (e.g., My teacher often gets angry), and independence versus dependency (e.g., My teacher helps me; see appendix for detailed information). Thus, we



sought to examine the factor structure Y-CATS using a Dutch sample of kindergartners and to explore the psychometric properties of the KLIC. We further aimed to advance understanding of gender differences in young children's relationship perceptions.

### *Gender Differences*

Gender differences play an important role in interpersonal relationships, with preschool girls being more nurturing and oriented towards social relationships than boys (Maccoby, 1998; Zahn Waxler et al., 2008). Studies based on teacher reports suggest that girls, compared to boys, experience less conflict and more closeness (e.g., Baker, 2006; Birch & Ladd, 1997; Hamre & Pianta, 2001). However, there is limited evidence on whether kindergarten boys and girls also hold differential beliefs about their relationships with teachers. Findings from studies using the Y-CATS are mixed. In one study (Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003) boys judged their relationship with teachers as more conflictual than girls but no differences were found in a later study (Mantzicopoulos, 2005).

There is some evidence that the developmental significance of teacher-child relationships is different for boys and girls. Recently, Ewing and Taylor (2009) discussed two theoretical perspectives that could explain these gender differences. The *gender role socialization perspective* predicts that girls are more sensitive to relationship quality because they are more socially oriented (Maccoby, 1998). This implies that girls profit more from close teacher-child relationships but also that they will be more hindered by poor relationships. According to the *academic risk perspective* especially children at-risk for school failure will be particularly sensitive to the social environment (Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Hence, teacher-child relationships may have a larger impact on the school adjustment of boys (who tend to be at higher risk for school-related problems) compared to girls. A third perspective, based on attachment research, draws attention to sex-stereotypic behavior in poor child-caregiver relationships. Turner (1991) argues that insecurity or 'lack of

confidence' in interpersonal relationships may be manifested in gender-typical problem behavior, that is withdrawn behavior for girls and disruptive or 'acting out' behavior for boys. Her research showed that insecure mother-child attachment was related to disruptive behavior in boys but to social inhibition in girls. Moreover, no gender differences in maladaptive behavior were found for children with secure attachments.

Few studies have examined gender differences in the association between teachers' perceptions of relationship quality and school adjustment. In line with the gender role socialization theory, positive relationships more strongly predicted social skills, work habits, and school competence for girls than boys (Baker, 2006; Ewing & Taylor, 2009; Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Conflict was found to be correlated with boys' but not girls' school competence as predicted by the academic risk perspective (Ewing & Taylor, 2009; Hamre & Pianta, 2001). However, Hamre and Pianta found this in upper elementary grades only. Furthermore, consistent with the hypothesis of sex-stereotypic behavior in unfavorable relationships, Ewing and Taylor showed that boys were rated as more antisocial than girls when having conflictual relationships with their teacher. However, there was no evidence that internalizing behavior was more typical for girls than boys with poor relationships. Since these studies were conducted entirely from the teacher's perspective, an important step forward would be to examine those theoretical perspectives on gender differences using data based on children's relational views.

#### *Summary of Research Objectives*

The overarching goal of this research was to obtain a child instrument of teacher-child relationships for young children with emerging reading abilities. A descriptive study was therefore conducted to investigate the psychometric properties of two relatively new instruments and to address concurrent linkages between kindergarten children's relationship perceptions and indicators of socio-emotional malfunctioning. The first goal of the present

study was to investigate the psychometric qualities of the KLIC and the Y-CATS. The sample was part of larger Dutch research project. This sample was considered appropriate because it is representative of the Western culture like the US sample in which the Y-CATS was first evaluated. In contrast to the US sample, different schools were included of which relatively few were located in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Also, we included kindergartners only, in order to obtain a more homogeneous sample of children with similar classroom experiences. In the Netherlands, *all* children attend two years of kindergarten (ages 4-6). Similar to US kindergarten classes, children learn basic social-behavioral and academic skills in preparation of the transition to formal schooling that starts in grade 1. Because kindergarten lasts for two years, many children had already spent about one year with the same teacher.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed to examine the factor structure of the instruments because the instruments were in the first phases of development. We evaluated the internal consistencies of the resulting factors and examined test-retest reliabilities to assess stability over time. To obtain support for convergent validity, we examined teacher-child agreement and associations with teacher-rated socio-emotional maladjustment (Aggression, ADHD, and Social Inhibition). In line with previous research, modest associations were expected.

Our second and third goals were to explore: (a) sex differences in children's perceptions of teacher-child relationships; and (b) whether the association between relationship quality and problem behaviors was moderated by sex. Because insufficient support exists for the three perspectives about the moderating role of sex explained earlier, particularly when children's relational views are considered, three sets of competing hypotheses were examined. First, according to the gender role socialization perspective, stronger associations were expected between girls' relationship perceptions and problem

behaviors (i.e., Aggression, ADHD, and Social Inhibition). Second, consistent with the academic risk perspective, stronger associations were hypothesized between boys' relationship perceptions and Aggression, and ADHD, and Social Inhibition. Third, considering the hypothesis of sex-stereotypic behavior in poor child-caregiver relationships, we expected girls' perceptions of non-close or conflictual relationships to have stronger associations with Social Inhibition, whereas boys' relationship perceptions were predicted to be related to Aggression and ADHD.

## Method

### *Sample*

The sample included 150 kindergarten children (54% boys) and their 16 (lead) teachers (one male<sup>1</sup>) from 6 regular primary education schools in the Netherlands. The mean age of the children was 69.5 months ( $SD = 6.23$ ). The mean age of the teachers was 44.9 years ( $SD = 9.1$ ). Teachers had on average 19.7 years ( $SD = 10.38$ ) of teaching experience and worked 4.3 days per week in the same class ( $SD = .68$ ).

Schools were recruited in neighborhoods with relatively low concentrations of non-western immigrants (2-9%). The participating schools were located in different parts of the Netherlands in neighborhoods with 27-44% of the families falling into the low-income category (i.e., 40% lowest incomes in the Netherlands) and 15.5-47% into the high-income category (i.e., 20% highest incomes).

### *Selection Criteria*

Only teachers working at least three days a week were allowed to participate because we presumed that children would have more stable representations of their relationships with

---

<sup>1</sup> This might be considered problematic since the pictures of the KLIC portray a female teacher. However, the examiners did not notice poorer test understanding in this class and exclusion of these students did not alter the internal structure.

these teachers compared to teachers who are spending half time or less with them.

Participating children had to be at least 5 years old. Children who had been in class with the particular teacher for less than two months were excluded. From the children who met the selection criteria, ten children were randomly selected in each class. Informed consent was obtained from parents. Fifty children (33.3%) of six classes from two different schools were randomly selected to participate in the retest.

### *Procedure*

Data were gathered in January and February because these months are relatively calm periods in most schools. The instruments (Y-CATS and KLIC) were administered individually to the children outside the classroom in a quiet setting during regular school days in the mornings. Prior to administration, children were asked to tell the name of their teacher to focus attention. They were assured that their responses would not be made known to their teacher or anyone else. The Y-CATS was administered first; the KLIC was administered a full week later. Teachers completed two questionnaires measuring children's behavior problems (BQTSYO-M) and relationship quality (STRS). Retests took place three weeks later according to similar administration procedures as described above.

### *Measures*

*Young Children's Appraisals of Teacher Support.* The Young Children's Appraisals of Teacher Support (Y-CATS; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003) was developed to measure young children's perceptions of the relationship with their teacher. The Warmth subscale measures children's perceptions of teacher support, encouragement, and acceptance (11 items: e.g., My teacher is my friend). The Conflict subscale assesses the child's perception of negativity in interactions with teachers (10 items: e.g., My teacher gets angry with me). Children's perception of teacher practices that promote autonomy and self-directed activities is measured with the Autonomy Support subscale (6 items: e.g., My teacher lets me

do activities I want to do). Cronbach's alphas are reported ranging from .58 to .75 for Warmth, .72 to .78 for Conflict and .57 to .70 for Autonomy (Mantzicopoulos, 2005; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003). The validity of the scales was demonstrated by modest teacher-child agreement and associations with academic achievement, social skills, and problem behaviors. The Y-CATS items were presented on small cards that were read to the child by the examiner. The original format utilized a mailbox to place cards that were judged by the child as 'true' and a trashcan for 'untrue' propositions. In the present study, a safe was used instead of a mailbox because a safe was considered more representative of confidentiality. Furthermore, we used two easily verifiable practice items: an untrue (i.e., My teacher has blue hair) and a true proposition (i.e., My teacher is taller than I am). Total administration time was about 10 minutes.

*Kindergartner-Teacher Interaction Computer test (KLIC).* The Kindergartner-Teacher Interaction Computer test or KLIC (Dutch abbreviation) was developed to measure children's perceptions of the relationship with their teacher (Van Dijk et al., 2006). We conducted pilot work including interviews with children and closely examined items used in other instruments (e.g., Y-CATS) in order to develop items with corresponding photographs that represented the three key relational dimensions (i.e., closeness, conflict, and dependency). This resulted in a computer test comprising twelve items (see Appendix) that was pilot-tested in two kindergarten classrooms. The items reflected a variety of interactions between a teacher and a child in specific situations reflecting emotional closeness and teacher support (5 items: e.g., My teacher always listens to me) and conflict in teacher-child interactions (4 items: e.g., My teacher often gets angry). In addition, several items reflecting teacher assistance or absence were included to measure independence versus over-reliance on the teacher (3 items: e.g., My teacher helps me; I am scared when my teacher is not there). The same adult and child were presented on all photographs. Since almost all kindergarten

teachers are female, the teacher on the photographs was female. Different sets of photographs were utilized for boys and girls, with target children of the same sex displayed on the photographs. For each item, two corresponding photographs were presented on a computer. Children first selected the photograph that applied best to their teacher. Second, they indicated to what extent the photograph was representative of their teacher by choosing between a small and a large circle. For example, item 3 'My teacher listens' was presented with one photograph on which a teacher actually attended to the target child who asked for assistance and one on which the same teacher looked in the same direction but was not attentive. The examiner discussed the content of the photographs with the child according to a standardized protocol (i.e., 'Where are you on the picture and what are you doing? Yes, that's right, you want to ask something and you hold your finger in the air. What is your teacher doing on this picture, and what on this picture? Yes, that's right, she is listening to you and you may ask your question but on the other picture she does not look at you'). Then the examiner asked which photograph was thought to be most representative of his or her teacher (i.e., 'Which picture applies most to your teacher <name>?'). Children had to click on that particular photograph with their mouse. Then the photograph that did not apply disappeared from the screen and two circles became visible under the chosen photograph. The instructor asked the child to what extent the photograph applied to his or her teacher. When the child chose the 'attentive teacher', the instructor asked: 'Does your teacher <name> *often* listen or does she *always* listen when you want to ask her something?'. In case the child chose the photograph displaying the teacher not attending the child, the instructor asked: 'Does your teacher <name> *sometimes* listens or does she *never* listen when you want to ask her a question?'. Children were instructed to click on the large circle if they thought that the photograph was always representative of their relationship with the teacher, and on the small circle when the photograph was considered representative for some of the time. In this way

four response options were possible (e.g., my teacher *never* listens; my teacher *sometimes* listens; my teacher *often* listens; my teacher *always* listens). The instructor provided explanation and instructions according to a standardized protocol. Furthermore, assistance was given with use of the mouse when needed. The test was presented on a computer to engage children's interest and sustain attention. Administration time was about 10 minutes.

*Evaluation of test understanding.* Children's comprehension of each child instrument was evaluated by each examiner on a 4-point scale (i.e., poor; moderate; good; very good) according to their own impression. When difficulties in item comprehension were noted, examiners recorded the reason by choosing among the following four prescribed explanations: verbal difficulties, inattentiveness, difficulties concerning test method, and other/not specified.

*Behavior checklist.* Teachers completed the Behavior Questionnaire for Two- to Six-Year-Olds-Modified (BQTSYO-M; Thijs, Koomen, De Jong, Van der Leij, & Van Leeuwen, 2004), which is a Dutch adaptation of the Preschool Behavior Questionnaire (PBQ; Behar, 1977). The checklist measures internalizing and externalizing problems. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (absolutely not characteristic) to 4 (very characteristic). Three subscales were included. Aggression refers to confrontative and hostile antisocial behavior (4 items: e.g., 'hits or kicks other children'). The subscale ADHD-Related Behavior contains items that represent hyperactivity and inattention (4 items: e.g., 'a busy child'). Social Inhibition (5 items: e.g., 'Shy or timid') refers to withdrawal from social interactions out of shyness or social anxiety. Adequate psychometric qualities have been reported, and the validity of the scales has been supported by significant associations with subscales of the CBCL in the expected directions (Goossens, Dekker, Bruinsma, & De Ruyter, 2000). Furthermore, the measure has been successfully employed in research on teachers' pedagogical practices (e.g., Thijs, Koomen, & Van der Leij, 2008). The internal consistency



is good for all subscales with Cronbach's alpha coefficients between .81-.93 in previous research (Thijs et al., 2004), and .72, .77, and .84 in the current sample for Aggression, ADHD-related behavior, and Social Inhibition, respectively.

*Teacher-rated relationship quality.* The Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS; Pianta, 2001) measures teacher perceptions of the relationship with a particular student. An authorized Dutch translated and adapted version of the STRS was employed (Koomen et al., 2007). The scale comprises three dimensions labeled Closeness (e.g., 'I share an affectionate, warm relationship with this child'; 'If upset, this child will seek comfort from me'), Conflict (e.g., 'Dealing with this child drains my energy'; 'This child and I always seem to be struggling with each other'), and Dependency (e.g., 'This child is overly dependent on me'; 'This child asks for my help when he/she really does not need help'). Closeness reflects the degree of warmth and open communication between the teacher and child. Conflict refers to negative and coercive interactions, whereas Dependency represents levels of clinginess and overdependence of the child. Items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all applicable) to 5 (highly applicable). The Closeness and Conflict in the Dutch version of the STRS were highly comparable to the American version. The Dependency scale was altered because of its relatively low internal consistency in previous research ( $\alpha = .64$ ; Pianta, 2001). For the Dutch version, research has reported internal consistency scores ranging between .88 - .93 for Closeness, .88 - .91 for Conflict, and .75-.82 for Dependency (Doumen, Verschueren, Koomen, & Buyse, 2008; Koomen et al., 2007). The validity of the scale is supported by significant associations with classroom observations, teacher stress indices, and children's behavioral adjustment (Doumen et al., 2008; Koomen et al., 2007). In the present study, a shortened version was used comprising the 5 items with the highest factor loadings per subscale. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .85, .75, and .81 for Closeness, Conflict, and Dependency, respectively.

*Data Analyses*

A series of exploratory factor analyses (EFA) using Maximum Likelihood (ML) were performed on the correlation matrix of each of the child instruments. When the assumption of normality was violated, principal factor procedures (PAF) were also performed (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). To decide on the number of components to retain, we examined Cattell's scree test (Cattell, 1966) and performed Velicer's minimal average partial (MAP) test (O'Connor, 2000). Components were rotated using the oblique direct oblimin procedure (Fabrigar et al., 1999). Items with factor pattern coefficients below .30 were excluded as well as items loading on multiple components, indicated by a difference in factor pattern coefficients smaller than .10. With respect to evaluations of reliability, scores between .60-.70 are in the acceptable range for research purposes, whereas scores  $> .70$  are considered satisfactory (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Hierarchical linear regression models were tested to examine whether children's sex moderated the association between the teacher-child relationship and behavior problems using interaction terms between sex and relationship qualities. Sex was dummy coded: 0 = male and 1 = female. Simple slopes for boys and girls, and regions of significance were examined to probe moderation effects (Aiken & West, 1991; Preacher, Curran, & Bauer, 2006). The region of significance indicates the values of the independent variable at which the regression lines of boys and girls become significantly different. Because unequal numbers of children per class participated, predictors were mean centered within clusters (Enders & Tofghi, 2007). Thus children's relationship ratings reflected scores relative to their classmates. Though child reports were nested within teachers, no multilevel analyses were conducted because there was no significant between-subject variance for all outcome variables, ICCs ranged from 0-7.6;  $p > .05$ . Residual plots were inspected to discover violations of assumptions of normality. Regression diagnostics were examined to detect

extreme outliers (standardized residual  $> 3$ ) and problems with multicollinearity among the independent variables in the models.

### *Missing Values*

Because of absence during test administration, there was 1 missing score on the Y-CATS and the KLIC. Also, one teacher had not completed questionnaires for all participating children in her class ( $n = 8$ ). Listwise deletion was used under the assumption of completely random missingness.

## Results

### *Evaluation of Children's Test Understanding*

According to the examiners, the large majority of children (87.9%) showed good to very good understanding of the Y-CATS ( $M=3.46$ ,  $SD=0.79$ ). Poor (3.4%) and moderate (8.7%) understanding was attributed to (a) verbal difficulties (6.7%), (b) inattentiveness (2%), (c) difficulties with the test method (15.3%), and (d) other/not specified (76%). The majority of children (84.6%) showed good to very good understanding of the test method of the KLIC as well ( $M=3.40$ ,  $SD =0.79$ ). According to the instructors, poor (0.7%) and moderate (14.7%) understanding was due to (a) verbal difficulties (10%), (b) inattentiveness (5.3%), (c) difficulties concerning test method (10%), and (d) other/not specified (74.7%).

### *Factor Analyses, Construction of Subscales, and Descriptives*

*Y-CATS.* Given nonnormality of 10 of the 27 items (skewness  $\geq 2$ ), EFA was performed using both ML and PAF. The ML solution is reported because ML and PAF produced very similar results (see Table 1). Both Cattell's scree test and the MAP test indicated a three-factor solution. Eigenvalues (EV) of the retained components were 3.3, 2.6, and 1.9. Factor pattern coefficients lower than .30 emerged (items 2, 16, 19, 21, and 25) as well as one cross-loading (item 18). We recomputed EFA without these items. The factor

solution fit the data adequately,  $\chi^2(150, N=149) = 162.396, p = ns$ , and explained 37.4% of the total variance. Items were largely distributed across the factors as expected. Following this analysis we calculated mean scores for each subscale by averaging the items making up each factor. Warmth and Autonomy Support were somewhat negatively skewed with 50.3% and 34.7% of children respectively having the highest possible score ( $sk = -1.64$  and  $-1.48$ , respectively). Still, a reasonable amount of variability was observed. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .65, .72, and .61 for Warmth, Conflict, and Autonomy Support, respectively. To evaluate stability over time, Pearson correlations were computed between the scores obtained at the first administration and at retest. Test-retest correlations were in the acceptable range for Warmth (.67,  $df = 48, p < .001$  respectively) and Conflict (.62,  $df = 48, p < .001$  respectively), but were lower for Autonomy Support (.53,  $df = 48, p < .001$ ).

*KLIC.* Both Cattell's scree test and the MAP analyses indicated a one-factor solution ( $EV = 4.9$ ). For three items (6, 8, and 11), factor pattern coefficients lower than .30 were observed. The factor structure was explored again without these items. The chi-square statistic indicated a reasonable fit,  $\chi^2(27, N=150) = 41.281, p = .04$ . The explained variance was 48.7%. Both positive and negative items were distributed along the same dimension in the expected direction. A relatively low factor pattern coefficient of .32 was obtained for the item 'My teacher smiles'. For the other items, coefficients between .63-.86 were obtained with the highest loadings for 'My teacher punishes me', 'I obey my teacher', and 'My teacher praises me' (see Appendix). Mean scores were calculated by reversing negative items and averaging all item scores. High scores indicated perceptions of a positive relationship characterized by warmth, affirmative feedback, and lack of correction. The scale was highly internally consistent ( $\alpha = .89$ ) and stable over time (test-retest Pearson  $r = .84, df = 48, p < .001$ ).

*Descriptive statistics.* In general, kindergarten children reported high levels of Warmth and Autonomy Support, and moderate levels of Conflict. Evaluations on the KLIC were also relatively positive. Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations of the subscales of the Y-CATS and KLIC. Warmth was positively correlated with Autonomy Support. Ratings on the KLIC were modestly related to Autonomy Support.

No significant Sex differences emerged on the subscales of the Y-CATS (Warmth:  $t [146] = -1.11, p = ns$ ; Conflict:  $t [146] = 1.38, p = ns$ ; Autonomy Support:  $t [146] = -0.90, p = ns$ ). Also on the KLIC, no sex differences were found ( $t [147] = 0.15, p = ns$ ).

#### *Teacher-Student Agreement*

To examine teacher-student agreement on relationship quality, bivariate correlations were computed between ratings of children and teachers. All correlations were in the expected directions and of modest magnitude (see Table 2). Children's perceptions of Warmth were positively correlated with teacher-rated Closeness and negatively with Conflict. In contrast, Conflict reported by children was negatively related to teacher-rated Closeness and positively to Conflict. Children's appraisal of Autonomy Support was positively related to teacher-rated Closeness. No significant correlations with teacher reports were found with the KLIC.

#### *Associations with Behavior Problems*

As expected, children's perceptions of the teacher-child relationship were modestly related to indices of maladaptive behavior (see Table 2). Warmth was negatively associated with Aggression and Social Inhibition. Conflict correlated positively with Aggression and ADHD, whereas Autonomy Support was negatively related to Aggression. The KLIC correlated negatively with Aggression and ADHD.

#### *Differential Associations with Behavior Problems for Boys and Girls*

Regression analyses proceeded in three steps. First, child sex was entered into the model. In the second step, we added children's cluster-mean centered relationship reports. And thirdly, interactions terms between relationship perceptions and sex were entered. Non-significant interaction terms were removed from the model. Child (demographic) characteristics (i.e., ethnicity and age) were non-significant covariates and were therefore not included in the models ( $p > .05$ ). For the models predicting Social Inhibition and Aggression, one and two extreme outliers respectively were removed from the analyses. Results are shown in Table 3.

Aggression was negatively predicted by Sex and Warmth. Children's sex moderated the association between Aggression and Warmth. Inspection of the simple slopes revealed that Aggression was negatively associated with Warmth for boys only (see Figure 1). Estimation of the region of significance showed significant sex differences when children's appraisals of Warmth were low to moderate (below 0.3 *SD*). Children's Sex also moderated the linkage between Aggression and Autonomy Support. Simple slope analyses revealed a marginally significant association for girls only. As shown in Figure 2, girls showed less aggression when levels of Autonomy Support were moderate to high (above -0.4 *SD*). The final model explained 21.4% of the variance,  $F(7,130) = 5.056, p < .01$ .

ADHD was negatively predicted by Sex and KLIC mean scores. No significant interaction terms emerged and the final model explained 20.4% of the variance,  $F(5,134) = 6.877, p < .01$ . Furthermore, no main effects on Social Inhibition were found. However, the association between Social Inhibition and Warmth was moderated by Sex. Inspection of simple slopes showed a negative association for girls only (see Figure 3). Girls with below average scores on Warmth (below -0.2 *SD*) were more likely to be rated socially inhibited than boys. The final model accounted for 8% of the variance and was marginally significant,  $F(6,132) = 1.980, p = .07$ .

### Discussion

Our research contributes to the growing literature on young children's relational perspectives in several important ways. First, we add to the knowledge base by providing evidence on the psychometric qualities of two instruments designed for use with young children. On the Y-CATS, children responded to propositions about the teacher as being 'true' or 'untrue' for them by placing small cards in either a safe or a trashcan. The KLIC was a newly developed computer test that employed photographs of teacher-child interactions to facilitate children's comprehension. Children evaluated the photographs according to a two-step procedure that was adapted from a measure of young children's self-competence beliefs (Harter & Pike, 1984). Second, in line with attachment-based research, the results suggest that children display sex-stereotypic problem behavior when having non-close teacher-child relationships.

#### *Measuring Children's Relational Perspectives*

The first goal of the present study was to evaluate the psychometric qualities of the Y-CATS and the KLIC. Examiner ratings confirmed that kindergarten children had a good understanding of the items and test format of both instruments. However, the results indicated different psychometric strengths and weaknesses for the two instruments. In line with prior research (Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003), a three-dimensional structure of the Y-CATS was found that largely corresponds with the theoretical constructs underlying teacher reports (Koomen et al., 2007; Pianta, 2001). Warmth reflected whether children perceived their teacher as caring and affectionate. Conflict comprised children's perceptions of their teacher as unkind, demanding, and harsh. Autonomy support represented children's perceptions of a classroom climate in which teachers create opportunities for children to initiate and direct their own activities. The reliabilities of the three subscales were, in general, lower than desired but were comparable to other measures of young children's beliefs and

attitudes about school (e.g., Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, & Blumenfeld, 1993; Harter & Pike, 1984; Stipek & Ryan, 1997; Valeski & Stipek, 2001). Expanding these subscales and testing their utility with additional samples is needed particularly in light of our finding that children's relationship perceptions are associated with teachers' behavior ratings. As we note later in this section, there were modest associations between the Y-CATS Warmth and Conflict subscales and children's aggression and social inhibition; these relationships were moderated by sex. Boys who tended to report that their relationship with their teacher was low on warmth were rated as more aggressive by their teachers. For girls, lower perceptions of warmth were linked to higher levels of social inhibition. These findings highlight the importance of considering not only children's relational perspectives, but also the differential role of relationship domains on developmental outcomes.

As expected, we found modest teacher-child agreement when we correlated teachers' ratings on the STRS with children's reports on the Y-CATS. This level of agreement is in line with previous research and confirms that there is some common ground in children's and teachers' views of relationships (e.g., Harrison et al., 2007; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003; Murray et al., 2008; Rey et al., 2007). The small level of agreement may be a result of limitations in young children's social information processing and/or method variance, considering that the teacher and child measures do not have parallel formats or items. Additionally, it may also be the case that the relational perceptions of teachers and students are guided by mental representations that are based on their unique social history with significant others (cf. Kennedy & Kennedy, 2004; Kesner, 2000; Lynch & Cicchetti, 1992; Rydell, Bohlin, & Thorell, 2005). Although this study was not structured to investigate the sources of non-shared variance between children's and teachers' relational views, it calls attention to the need for research on this issue.



On the KLIC, children evaluated the relationship with their teacher via photographs portraying teacher-child interactions. The KLIC had an unidimensional structure that reflected a global, affective quality of the teacher-child relationship. High scores on the KLIC indicated harmonious relationships characterized by teacher support and mutual cooperation. Conversely, at the low end, the relationship is characterized by discordance as the teacher and the child are 'moving against each other'. The teacher is disciplining the child, while the child is inclined to noncompliance. Though a multidimensional structure was expected, support for a global, affective measure can be found in the literature. For instance, positive and negative interpersonal feelings cluster together on the Emotional quality subscale of the Relatedness Questionnaire for older children (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1992). Also, in the Interpersonal theory of Leary (1957) the affective-quality dimension labeled Affiliation ranges from hostility to warmth/cooperation; this construct has been applied to teacher-child interactions in kindergarten (Thijs, Koomen, Roorda & Ten Hagen, 2009; Koomen, Verschueren & Thijs, 2006). Of note, the small number of items could also explain why the KLIC appeared unidimensional.

Promising features of the KLIC were its high internal consistency and stability over time, good comprehension of the item content and format by the children, and the normal distribution of scores. We obtained only limited support for the validity of the scale. Comparisons between scores on the KLIC and the STRS yielded only a marginally significant negative association with Dependency ( $p < .10$ ). There were modest associations with children's maladaptive and aggressive behaviors. ADHD-related behavior was uniquely predicted by children's ratings on the KLIC but not by scales of the Y-CATS. It is possible that hyperactivity hinders circle conversations and seat work, and therefore has triggered recollections of reprimands (e.g., item 2 and 4) and relatively few recollections of praise (e.g., item 7). It could be argued that teachers' pedagogical practices involving classroom or

behavior management (i.e., reprimand and praise) are overrepresented in the KLIC. Revisions of the scale should focus on the measure's construct validity through the development of additional items. Items that portray distant or detached interactions are necessary as well as more variety across the school contexts (e.g., playground) within which teacher-child interactions occur. Waters and Cummings (2000) emphasize that secure attachment not only refers to children's confidence in the caregiver's availability but also to children's skillful use of this source of support. Inclusion of items such as 'When I am sad, I go to my teacher for comfort' might also be important additions to the KLIC.

Only small associations between the Y-CATS and KLIC were found. Children with more positive appraisals on the KLIC reported higher levels of autonomy support. When correlations were calculated using within-cluster-centered mean scores, also a positive association between warmth and the KLIC emerged ( $r = .16, p < .05$ ). Though the limited convergence may be partly due to the different formats of the measures, it is also possible that distinct constructs were measured. The Y-CATS exclusively focuses on each child's perceptions of attitudes and interpersonal behaviors of the teacher to the child, whereas with the KLIC children are presented photographs that portray both teacher and child behaviors. Furthermore, photographs, more than verbally presented propositions, may have triggered children's recollections of specific experiences that affected their responses. Lastly, due to the smaller number of items, the KLIC represents a smaller sample of interpersonal experiences.

In sum, although the challenges in developing measures for young children are considerable, the Y-CATS as well as the method of the KLIC demonstrated potential value. The study largely supported the factor structure of the Y-CATS as found in the US sample, thereby allowing for generalization of the results and further construct validation using confirmatory factor analyses. Furthermore, this study indicated acceptable stability over time

for the subscales Warmth and Conflict, and highlighted the multidimensionality of the Y-CATS as an important quality. Compared to the Y-CATS, the high reliability of the KLIC and the normal distribution of scores were considered major strengths of the measure. The children responded well to the two-step procedure that yielded results along a 4-point scale. Furthermore, we obtained evidence that young children are capable of understanding questions that are made contextually relevant through the use of pictures accompanied by verbal prompts. However, the measure is short and additional work is needed to establish its validity. To obtain support for the construct validity of the instruments, future studies could explore additional methods such as puppet interviews (Verschuere, Marcoen, & Schoefs, 1996) or peer nominations (Hughes, Zhang, & Hill, 2006).

*The Role of Gender in the Association of Relationship Quality with Problem Behaviors*

Teachers generally report less conflict and more closeness in relationships with girls compared to boys (e.g., Birch & Ladd, 1997; Hamre & Pianta, 2001). In contrast to their teachers, boys and girls did not seem aware of these differences in relationship quality and rated their relationships equally positive. Yet associations between relationship perceptions and maladaptive behavior did vary by sex. We found that warmth was more strongly related to aggression in boys but to social inhibition in girls. More specifically, girls experiencing non-close or distant relationships were more likely to be seen as socially inhibited by their teacher, whereas boys with non-close relationships were rated as more aggressive. No mean differences were found in levels of maladaptive behavior between boys and girls with warm relationships. These findings were in line with the prediction based on attachment research that children display sex-stereotypic behavior when having poor child-caregiver relationships (Turner, 1991). It seems that feelings of insecurity and lack of confidence in the teacher are manifested in maladaptive behavior, but how this is expressed in particular behavior may depend, at least in part, on sex. Notably, additional analyses on teacher reports not reported

here did not reveal similar moderating effects of children's sex, and this parallels prior research into teachers' perceptions of relationship quality (Ewing et al., 2009).

Less support was found for the gender role socialization perspective and the academic risk perspective. No consistent gender differences in the associations between teacher-child relationship qualities and indicators of maladjustment were found, though there was some evidence that girls but not boys display less aggression when they perceive more autonomy support from teachers. This was most consistent with the gender role socialization perspective. Positive indices of social-emotional and academic competence are needed for a more comprehensive evaluation of the hypotheses.

### *Conclusions and Implications*

Our findings suggest some implications for practice. First, teachers and other practitioners need to consider problem behavior from an interpersonal perspective. It is important to recognize the possibility that children's maladaptive behaviors are manifestations of insecurity and the undermining feeling that they are not being valued. In our sample, the girls who were viewed as socially inhibited by their teachers were mostly those who sensed that their teacher didn't care for them, and who judged their relationship with their teacher as lacking warmth. Similarly, aggressive boys were more likely to report low levels of warmth. Teachers need to be mindful of children's need for belongingness that involves being cared about, valued and recognized as individuals. Yet, it is possible that even though teachers do express affection, children may perceive it differently due to a history of negative experiences with other caregivers (Howes & Hamilton, 1992) or because of negative attribution styles (McElwain, Booth-LaForce, Lansford, Wu, & Dyer, 2008). Second, our findings highlight that we cannot rely on the teacher's perspective only. However, to date there are no child measures available that can be used in practice. Therefore, researchers are urged to continue to explore and evaluate measurement methods in order to obtain

instruments that meet the criteria for individual assessments. The measures employed in the present study constituted promising approaches that merit attention in future research.

Several qualifications of the study need to be considered. First, this study is among the first to explore sex differences from the perspective of the child and replication of findings is needed before firm conclusions can be drawn. Second, the data preclude causal inferences. Children's behavior problems could be antecedents as well as consequences of poor relationship quality, or both may result from a shared underlying cause, for instance poor mother-child attachment. Third, the present Dutch sample included 5- and 6-year old kindergartners from relatively ethnically homogenous and mostly middle-class neighborhoods. This limits the generalizability of the findings to other age ranges and to culturally-diverse or at-risk populations. Also, larger samples are needed to validate the factor structures of the instruments.

In conclusion, we established that kindergarten children are capable of providing reliable and meaningful information regarding their perceptions of teacher-child relationships. The results were in line with previous research on the Y-CATS, and provided a starting point for future construct validation. Although the validity of the KLIC was insufficient at this point, the KLIC method proved highly reliable and merits further scale development. In addition, the study showed the importance of the child's perspective for understanding the significance of the teacher-child relationship for children's classroom problem behaviors, and how this may vary by gender.

## References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Baker, J. A. (1999). Teacher-student interaction in urban at-risk classrooms: Differential behavior, relationship quality, and student satisfaction with school. *Elementary School Journal*, 100, 57-70.
- Baker, J. A. (2006). Contributions of teacher-child relationships to positive school adjustment during elementary school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 211-229.
- Behar, L. B. (1977). The Preschool Behavior Questionnaire. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 5, 265-275.
- Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 61-79.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment (2nd ed.)*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). *Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology (2nd ed.)*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Chambers, C. T., & Johnston, C. (2002). Developmental differences in children's use of rating scales. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 27, 27-36.
- Daniels, D. H., & Perry, K. E. (2003). "Learner-Centered" according to children. *Theory into Practice*, 42, 102-108.
- Doumen, S., Verschueren, K., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Buyse, E. (2008). *Observed teacher-child interactions and teacher perceived relationship quality: Their concordance and associations with school engagement*. Paper presented at the 30th ISPA International Conference, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

- Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., Harold, R. D., & Blumenfeld, P. (1993). Age and gender differences in children's self- and task perceptions during elementary school. *Child Development*, 64, 830-847.
- Eder, R. A. (1990). Uncovering young children's psychological selves: Individual and developmental differences. *Child Development*, 61, 849-863.
- Eiser, C., Mohay, H., & Morse, R. (2000). The measurement of quality of life in young children. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 26, 401-413.
- Enders, C. K., & Tofighi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.
- Ewing, A. R., & Taylor, A. R. (2009). The role of child gender and ethnicity in teacher-child relationship quality and children's behavioral adjustment in preschool. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 24, 92-105.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (3rd ed.)*: SAGE Publications.
- Goossens, F. A., Dekker, P., Bruinsma, C., & De Ruyter, P. A. (2000). *De Gedrags Vragenlijst voor Peuters en Kleuters: Factor structuur, betrouwbaarheid en validiteit. [Behavior questionnaire for 2- to 6-year-olds: factor structure, reliability, and validity]*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72, 625-638.
- Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Downer, J. T., & Mashburn, A. J. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of conflict with young students: Looking beyond problem behaviors. *Social Development*, 17, 115-136.

- Harrison, L. J., Clarke, L., & Ungerer, J. A. (2007). Children's drawings provide a new perspective on teacher-child relationship quality and school adjustment. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22, 55-71.
- Harter, S., & Pike, R. (1984). The pictorial scale of Perceived Competence and Social Acceptance for Young Children. *Child Development*, 55, 1969-1982.
- Howes, C., & Hamilton, C. E. (1992). Children's relationships with caregivers: Mothers and child care teachers. *Child Development*, 63, 859-866.
- Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Jackson, T. (1999). Influence of the teacher-student relationship on childhood conduct problems: A prospective study. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 28, 173-184.
- Hughes, J. N., & Villarreal, V. (2008, July). *Teacher, student, and peer reports of teacher-student relationship support: Joint and unique contributions to academic and social adjustment*. Paper presented at the 30th ISPA International Conference, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- Hughes, J. N., Zhang, D., & Hill, C. R. (2006). Peer assessments of normative and individual teacher-student support predict social acceptance and engagement among low-achieving children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 447-463.
- Kennedy, J. H., & Kennedy, C. E. (2004). Attachment theory: Implications for school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41, 247-259.
- Kesner, J. E. (2000). Teacher characteristics and the quality of child-teacher relationships. *Journal of School Psychology*, 38, 133-149.
- Koomen, H. M. Y., Verschueren, K., & Pianta, R. C. (2007). *Leerling Leerkracht Relatie Vragenlijst: Handleiding [Student Teacher Relationship Scale: Manual]*. Houten: Bohn Stafleu van Loghum.



- Koomen, H. M. Y., Verschueren, K., & Thijs, J. T. (2006). Assessing aspects of the teacher-child relationship: A critical ingredient of a practice-oriented psycho-diagnostic approach. *Educational and Child Psychology, 23*, 50-60.
- Ladd, G. W., & Burgess, K. B. (2001). Do relational risks and protective factors moderate the linkages between childhood aggression and early psychological and school adjustment? *Child Development, 72*, 1579-1601.
- Little, M., & Kobak, R. (2003). Emotional security with teachers and children's stress reactivity: A comparison of special-education and regular-education classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 32*, 127-138.
- Lynch, M., & Cicchetti, D. (1992). Maltreated children's reports of relatedness to their teachers. In R.C. Pianta (Ed). *Beyond the parent: The role of other adults in children's lives* (pp. 81 107). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press.
- Mantzicopoulos, P. (2005). Conflictual relationships between kindergarten children and their teachers: Associations with child and classroom context variables. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*, 425-442.
- Mantzicopoulos, P., & Neuharth-Pritchett, S. (2003). Development and validation of a measure to assess head start children's appraisals of teacher support. *Journal of School Psychology, 41*, 431-451.
- McElwain, N. L., Booth-LaForce, C., Lansford, J. E., Wu, X., & Dyer, W. J. (2008). A process model of attachment-friend linkages: Hostile attribution biases, language ability, and mother-child affective mutuality as intervening mechanisms. *Child Development, 79*, 1891-1906.

- Meehan, B. T., Hughes, J. N., & Cavell, T. A. (2003). Teacher-student relationships as compensatory resources for aggressive children. *Child Development, 74*, 1145-1157.
- Murray, C., Murray, K. M., & Waas, G. A. (2008). Child and teacher reports of teacher-student relationships: Concordance of perspectives and associations with school adjustment in urban kindergarten classrooms. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29*, 49-61.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory (3rd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 32*, 396-402.
- O'Connor, E., & McCartney, K. (2007). Examining teacher-child relationships and achievement as part of an ecological model of development. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*, 340-369.
- Patrick, H., Mantzicopoulos, P., Samarapungavan, A., & French, B. F. (2008). Patterns of young children's motivation for science and the teacher-child relationship. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 76*, 121-144.
- Pianta, R. C. (2001). *Student-Teacher Relationship Scale. Professional Manual*. Lutz, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B., & Stuhlman, M. (2003). Relationships between teachers and children. In W.M.Reynolds, & G. E. Miller (Eds). *Handbook of psychology: Educational psychology*. Vol. 7. (pp. 199-234). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pianta, R. C., Steinberg, M. S., & Rollins, K. B. (1995). The first two years of school: Teacher-child relationships and deflections in children's classroom adjustment. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 295-312.

- Pianta, R. C., & Stuhlman, M. W. (2004). Teacher-child relationships and children's success in the first years of school. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 444-458.
- Preacher, K. J., Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2006). Computational tools for probing interactions in multiple linear regression, multilevel modeling, and latent curve analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 31(4), 437-448.
- Rey, R. B., Smith, A. L., Yoon, J., Somers, C., & Barnett, D. (2007). Relationships between teachers and urban African American children: The role of informant. *School Psychology International*, 28, 346-364.
- Rydell, A. M., Bohlin, G., & Thorell, L. B. (2005). Representations of attachment to parents and shyness as predictors of children's relationships with teachers and peer competence in preschool. *Attachment and Human Development*, 7, 187-204.
- Silver, R. B., Measelle, J. R., Armstrong, J. M., & Essex, M. J. (2005). Trajectories of classroom externalizing behavior: Contributions of child characteristics, family characteristics, and the teacher-child relationship during the school transition. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 39-60.
- Stipek, D. J., & Ryan, R. H. (1997). Economically disadvantaged preschoolers: Ready to learn but further to go. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(4), 711-723.
- Thijs, J. T., Koomen, H. M. Y., De Jong, P. F., Van der Leij, A., & Van Leeuwen, M. G. P. (2004). Internalizing behaviors among kindergarten children: measuring dimensions of social withdrawal with a checklist. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 33, 802-812.
- Thijs, J. T., Koomen, H. M. Y., Roorda, D. L., & Ten Hagen, J. (2009). Explaining early teacher-child interactions: An interpersonal theoretical approach. *Submitted for publication*.

- Thijs, J. T., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Van der Leij, A. (2008). Teacher-child relationships and pedagogical practices: Considering the teacher's perspective. *School Psychology Review, 37*, 244-260.
- Turner, P. J. (1991). Relations between attachment, gender, and behavior with peers in preschool. *Child Development, 62*, 1475-1488.
- Valeski, T. N., & Stipek, D. J. (2001). Young children's feelings about school. *Child Development, 72*, 1198-1213.
- Valiente, C., Lemery Chalfant, K., Swanson, J., & Reiser, M. (2008). Prediction of children's academic competence from their effortful control, relationships, and classroom participation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 67-77.
- Van Dijk, M., De Graaff, K., Knotter, M., & Koster, J. (2006). *KLICt het? De ontwikkeling van de KLIC-test voor het meten van de perceptie van de leerkracht-leerling relatie bij 5-6 jarige kinderen. [Does it click? The development of the KLIC-test to measure perceptions of the teacher-child relationship by five- to six-year old students]*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Verschueren, K., Marcoen, A., & Schoefs, V. (1996). The internal working model of the self, attachment, and competence in five-year-olds. *Child Development, 67*, 2493-2511.
- Waters, E., & Cummings, E. M. (2000). A secure base from which to explore close relationships. *Child Development, 71*, 164-172.
- Zahn Waxler, C., Park, J. H., Usher, B., Belouad, F., Cole, P., & Gruber, R. (2008). Young children's representations of conflict and distress: A longitudinal study of boys and girls with disruptive behavior problems. *Development and Psychopathology, 20*, 99-119.

## Appendix

*Content of the items and corresponding photographs presented with the KLIC*

Item	Description of Situation: Photograph 1/Photograph 2
1. My teacher smiles (w)	Circle conversation: Smiling face of teacher/Neutral face of teacher
2. My teacher punishes me (c)	Circle setting, teacher reads from a book: Child is placed outside circle by teacher/Child listens carefully
3. My teacher listens to me (w)	Child wants to ask question and holds finger in air: Teacher listens/Teacher body towards child but doesn't attend
4. My teacher rebukes me (c)	Circle setting, teacher reads from a book: Child makes fun and teacher points her finger/Child listens carefully
5. I am (dis)obedient (c)	Child at teacher's desk staring at teacher's pen while teacher points her finger: Child does nothing/Child grabs pen
6. I ask my teacher for help (d)	Child works on a difficult task: Teacher assists child at teacher's desk/Child works alone
7. My teacher praises me (w)	Child sits on a table and solves a puzzle: Teacher gives thumbs up/Teacher only watches
8. My teacher works with me (d)	Group seatwork, child solves a puzzle: Teacher works with child/Teacher works with another child
9. My teacher is angry (c)	Child has dropped bike at schoolyard: Teacher points her finger/Teacher with arms open, showing that it's all right
10. My teacher comforts me (w)	Child lays crying on the floor with face covered: Teacher gently touches the child/Teacher is absent
11. My teacher likes me (w)	Child on wall bars, while teacher standing next to him: Teacher strokes the child's head/Teacher only watches
12. I am scared (d)	Circle conversation with unknown teacher: Child in crouching position on seat/Child talks to teacher

*Note 1.* KLIC = Dutch abbreviation of Kindergartner-Teacher Interaction Computer test

*Note 2.* (w) = Warmth, (c) = Conflict, (d) = Dependency

Table 1. *Rotated factor solution of the Y-CATS (N = 149)*

Questionnaire Items <i>My teacher...</i>	Factors		
	1	2	3
10. Is my friend (w)	<b>.76</b>	-.08	.11
1. Likes my family (w)	<b>.56</b>	.01	-.09
13. Says nice things about my work (w)	<b>.50</b>	.11	-.05
3. Tells me I am smart (w)	<b>.49</b>	.05	-.03
7. Likes me (w)	<b>.47</b>	-.05	.16
27. Smiles a lot (w)	<b>.35</b>	.05	-.11
16. Helps me when I don't understand (w)	-	-	-
19. Tells good stories (w)	-	-	-
21. Remembers special days for me (w)	-	-	-
25. Answers my questions (w)	-	-	-
8. Tells me that I am doing something wrong (c)	.01	<b>.61</b>	.13
14. Gets (easily) angry with me (c)	.05	<b>.57</b>	-.07
5. Tells me to do work that is too hard for me (c)	-.01	<b>.56</b>	.14
11. Tells me to stop doing work I like doing (c)	.02	<b>.53</b>	.06
17. Is (sometimes) mean (c)	-.06	<b>.51</b>	-.06
20. Tells me that I don't try hard enough (c)	.05	<b>.49</b>	-.23
26. Tells me to do work I don't want to do (c)	.03	<b>.43</b>	.12
22. Has too many rules for our class (c)	-.03	<b>.42</b>	-.01
24. Tells me I do not listen (c)	-.05	<b>.39</b>	-.05
2. Tells me I am going to get into trouble a lot (c)	-	-	-
9. Lets me choose work that I want to do (a)	-.08	.06	<b>-.69</b>
15. Lets me do activities that I want to do (a)	-.06	-.09	<b>-.68</b>
12. Lets me do different activities (a)	.12	.07	<b>-.44</b>
23. Chooses me as a special helper (w)	.02	.04	<b>-.38</b>
4. Makes the class fun (w)	.01	-.11	<b>-.33</b>
6. Does activities with me (a)	.22	-.09	<b>-.32</b>
18. Lets me choose where I sit (a)	-	-	-

*Note.* Expected pattern: (w) = Warmth, (c) = Conflict, (a) = Autonomy Support

Table 2.

*Descriptive statistics and inter-correlations of the study variables*

Scales	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<u>Y-CATS (<i>n</i> = 149)</u>												
1. Warmth	.85	.20	-	-.12	.28**	.11	.22**	-.30**	-.11	-.20*	-.12	-.16*
2. Conflict	.37	.26		-	-.06	-.03	-.22**	.17*	-.01	.20*	.15*	.09
3. Autonomy	.81	.22			-	.15*	.25**	-.09	-.11	-.15*	-.12	-.01
<u>KLIC (<i>n</i> = 149)</u>												
4. Mean score	2.94	.78				-	.03	-.05	-.12	-.14*	-.18*	.12
<u>STRS (<i>n</i> = 142)</u>												
5. Closeness	4.04	.78					-	-.20**	.02	-.18*	-.03	-.38**
6. Conflict	1.44	.66						-	.32**	.58**	.55**	-.18*
7. Dependency	1.86	.86							-	.14*	.17*	.03
<u>BQTSYO-M (<i>n</i> = 142)</u>												
8. Aggression	1.16	.31								-	.43**	-.28**
9. ADHD	1.53	.62									-	-.41**
10. Social Inh.	1.52	.64										-

*Note 1.* Y-CATS = Young Children's Appraisals of Teacher Support; KLIC = Kindergarten-Teacher Interaction Computer test; STRS = Student-Teacher Relationship Scale; BQTSYO-M = Behavior Questionnaire for Two- to Six-Year-Olds-Modified; Social Inh. = Social Inhibition

*Note 2.* \* $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$  (one-tailed)

Table 3.

*Hierarchical regression models predicting Aggression, ADHD, and Social Inhibition*

	Aggression ( <i>n</i> = 138)				ADHD ( <i>n</i> = 140 )				Social Inhibition ( <i>n</i> = 139)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$
<i>Step 1</i>				.08**				.10**				.01
Sex (female)	-.13	.04	-.24**		-.36	.10	-.29**		.15	.11	.12	
<i>Step 2</i>				.08*				.10**				.03
Warmth	-.52	.16	-.35**		.24	.28	.07		.29	.39	.08	
Conflict	.16	.09	.14		.28	.20	.11		.41	.22	.16	
Autonomy	.14	.15	.11		-.19	.24	-.06		.01	.26	.00	
KLIC	-.06	.05	-.09		-.43	.12	-.29 **		.16	.13	.11	
<i>Step 3</i>				.05*				-				.05**
Warmth x Sex	.65	.25	.28*		-	-	-		-1.50	.60	-.28**	
Conflict x Sex	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	
Autonomy x Sex	-.41	.21	-.22*		-	-	-		-	-	-	
KLIC x Sex	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	

*Note 1.* KLIC = Kindergarten-Teacher Interaction Computer test*Note 2.* \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$  (two-tailed)




Figure Captions

*Figure 1.* Warmth x Sex interaction predicting Aggression


*Figure 2.* Autonomy Support x Sex interaction predicting Aggression

*Figure 3.* Warmth x Sex interaction predicting Social Inhibition




Note 1. White area is region of significance

Note 2. Low, medium, and high refer to  $-1 SD$ , mean, and  $+1 SD$ , respectively



Note 1. White area is region of significance

Note 2. Low, medium, and high refer to  $-1 SD$ , mean, and  $+1 SD$ , respectively



Note 1. White area is region of significance

Note 2. Low, medium, and high refer to  $-1 SD$ , mean, and  $+1 SD$ , respectively

